



PATENT
RECEIVED

MAR 09 2004

REMARKS

Technology Center 2600

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-24 have been rejected by the Examiner. In the above amendments, claims 1, 2, 7, 22 & 23 have been amended. Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

102 Rejections

In the Office Action mailed June 19, 2003, the Examiner has rejected claim 1-7, 9-19 and 21-23 as being anticipated by Walton et al. (US 6,493,331 B1) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, "...enabling each of the plurality of transmission sources to transmit data on assigned time slots; wherein phasing of each assigned time slot is set to allow for receipt of an ACK or a NAK prior to a next transmission of that assigned time slot.," in claim 7, "...defining time slots for data transmission, wherein each time slot corresponds to a predetermined time interval to allow receipt of an ACK or a NAK...," in claim 22, "...wherein phasing of each assigned time slot is set to allow for receipt of an ACK or a NAK prior to a next transmission of that assigned time slot...: and in claim 23, "...a controller operatively coupled to the data processor and configured to direct transmission of the plurality of slots over a plurality of time slots assigned to the access point, to phase each assigned time slot to allow for receipt of an ACK or a NAK prior to a next transmission of that assigned time slot; and to prevent transmission over one or more time slots designated for no transmission by the access point."

Walton, the cited reference, does not disclose delaying a next transmission of a time slot sufficient to allow for receipt of a positive (ACK) or negative acknowledgement (NAK).

As such, Applicants believe that the amended claims 1, 2, 7, 22 and 23 are in a condition for allowance. Further, it is Applicants' position that the dependent claims are also allowable for the same reasons as their independent claims are patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walton*.

Applicants' believe that claims 8 and 20 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims are patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walton* in view of *Blanchette et al.* (US 6,094,429).

It is Applicants' position that dependent claim 24 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as it's amended independent claim 23 is patentable.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/26/2004

By: 

Michael D. Graham, Reg. No. 51,751
(858) 658-5877

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502